

<b>United States Department of Agriculture</b>	<b>Forest Service</b>	<b>Siskiyou National Forest</b>	<b>200 NE Greenfield Road PO Box 440 Grants Pass, Oregon 97526</b>
--	---------------------------	---	--

Reply to : 1920 Planning

Subject: Implementation Monitoring

To: District Rangers

I need to communicate the results of our forest-wide implementation monitoring trip. Thank you and your people for a job well done. I am always impressed with the diversity of our people and their successful talents. Included with this letter is a summary of our stops and observations. Your time and energy in providing a first rate effort was evident.

A common theme among all stops was and is a strong need to effectively communicate. Communication between the districts, supervisor's office, regional office, and the Washington office is part of this effort. A second aspect is the need to communicate between disciplines. Our diversity is our strength. It is evident to me that we need each other's support and expertise. For example, the planner needs the wildlife biologist, the hydrologist needs the engineer, and the silviculturist needs the geologist. Another facet of this communication thread is with our publics, watershed councils, local governments, and federal officials.

I encourage you to facilitate these communications. Strategically thinking, we need to act as one government across agencies. We need to ensure our publics are aware of their lands and our actions.

Again, thanks for a job well done. This feedback is intended as a tool to share information across the Forest.

Sincerely,

/s/ J. MICHAEL LUNN  
Forest Supervisor  
Siskiyou National Forest

# **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND STOPS SISKIYOU NATIONAL FOREST FIELD TRIP**

## **Day One - Powers Ranger District**

### **Road 333 Flood Damage (figures one and two)**

The storm-damaged road is a disturbance in the ecosystem. Several appropriate questions need to be asked. What are the downstream impacts? How much disturbance to the ecosystem is needed and how much is too much? The watershed analysis addresses some answers to these questions. Supplemental funding for flood effects was discussed.

### **Tree Lining Project (figure 3)**

This stream improvement project provided large wood to the Coquille River. The watershed analysis documented the need for this project. The District did a good job monitoring this project. They photographed sites, tagged large wood, and used Harvard Graphics to document wood movement. Max Yager had ropes tied on small debris for fish cover. The group appreciated the natural looking appearance of the stream improvement project.

### **Wildlife - Transplant of Elk & Monitoring of Cougar/Martens (figure 4)**

The District deserves credit for working collaboratively with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. The objectives for monitoring were not clearly defined. The monitoring results were interesting. One elk was eaten by a lion. The District also has captured pictures of martens and lions.

### **Replacement Units for 318 Sales (Figure 5)**

The District and Forest implemented the replacement units for Boulder Crab and Elk Fork timber sales using special Secretary Regulations. The District implemented the S&Gs for the NW Forest Plan, even though no NEPA work was completed for the project. The District did an excellent job of monitoring wildlife trees.

## **Day Two - Gold Beach and Chetco Ranger Districts**

### **Sprat Thinning (Figure 6)**

The District designed this thinning project, in Late Successional Reserves, to accelerate the old-growth characteristics of the stand. Multistory and multi species (including POC) objectives are evident. The Riparian Reserve management is a good example of proactive activity within the Riparian Reserves.

### Blowgun Salvage (Figure 7)

This salvage sale is in Matrix and Riparian Reserve allocations. Adequate amounts of blowdown in the intermittent streams provided structure for the Riparian Reserves. Skidding away from Riparian Reserves helped to accomplish the Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives. Placement of the matrix reserve trees close to the Riparian Reserves provided for future inputs of large wood.

### Road Decommissioning (figure 8)

This stop illustrated a culvert and fill removal during road decommissioning. The amount of road fills across streams in Key Watersheds is significant. Decommissioning has several important aspects. The width at the bottom after the culvert is removed is important for stabilization. The District is adequately monitoring for revegetation. Decommissioning costs are expensive and come from restoration dollars. Changes in land allocations did not allow us to walk away from these roads. The District followed their priorities listed in the watershed analysis. They also considered Phytophthora concerns. This excellent presentation provided a good example of our restoration efforts in Key Watersheds.

### Day Three - Illinois Valley Ranger District

### Nicore Mining (figures 9 & 10)

This mining proposal, located along Rough and Ready Creek, has potentially volatile issues of plant species and stream crossings. The proponent, Walt Freeman, gave us a good presentation from his perspective. He expects us to be open and honest.

### Onion Camp - Private Land within the Kalmiopsis Wilderness (figure 11)

This stop illustrates a dispute with the owners of private property within the Kalmiopsis Wilderness. The District recognizes POC issues as part of a solution. Planning will facilitate the dispute. Many people recognize this private land issue is not an unique issue. The District has many other folks within the Region who have experience with this issue. The planning will be expensive. One suggestion was to contract a sociologist to explore ways to improve communications within the community. Consultants, similar to the Gold Beach Lodge Boat EA involvement, can help collaborative efforts to solve these problems. Parties tend to anchor their position rather quickly.

## Day Four - Conclusions

The trip was good for RO folks to get “grounded”. Earnest dialogue is necessary for solving problems - don’t let them fester. The trip demonstrated very talented people at all levels of the Siskiyou National Forest.

### Items of Note:

1. Healthy partnerships with local watershed councils and communities are evident. These are good.
2. 7% of the Forest is Matrix. However, there were many stops in other land allocations. The SNF is actively managing 100% of the land for various allocation objectives. The Forest needs to recognize this.
3. Documented monitoring of the range of the Marbled Murrelet does not agree with the protocol for surveys. Need to document it thoroughly and work with our partners to change the protocol. This is a classic example of good monitoring which needs to result in change. Agencies need to work together. Region 6 is probably ahead of the other regions. Need to tie in with research. A good example is Dr. Michael Amaranthus.
4. Need to link monitoring efforts to the proper funding. Saw many good examples of this.
5. The Forest does good work with water quality, especially the Chetco Ranger District. The water quality off-Forest is limited for salmon recovery. Consequently, there is a great need to work with watershed councils for salmon success. Downstream improvements off-forest are essential for the fish.
6. The POC issue transcends all resources.
7. The diversity of the ecosystem is reflected in the workforce.
8. The Forest is implementing the S&Gs of the NW Forest Plan to make it work.
9. The Forest Monitoring Plan may need changes - consider WO guidance. May or may not want to wait until the Forest Plan Revision in 2003.
10. A strategic way to look at community interactions is to get a third set of trained eyes to facilitate the behaviors/interactions with our publics.

### Critique of the Trip.

Keep up the good pace. District folks are important. Looking at the hard stuff is important. District business is complicated and diverse. The amount of work leading up to implementation is large. Peter Gaulke added much to the conversation on the trip.